Don Edwards
August 27, 2003

# Slip-stacking Review Questions

1. Protons on Target, Kourbanis, DoE Review
   - Transparency 3 – WBS Summary
     (a) Comment on the doubling of 1.3.1.1 between the Temple and DoE Reviews
     (b) Is contingency included within an item, e.g., $1.310M, or should be added to the figure?
   - Transparency 12 – Beam Loading Compensation (2): Please explain the distinction between bullets 3 and 4
   - Transparency 13 – 1 nC is 10% of your goal; am I right in assuming that this is general demonstration of the effectiveness of feedback?
   - Transparency 14 – The axes are not readable to me; explanation would be useful.
   - Transparency 15 – $5.210^{12}$ looks as good to me as $10^{12}$ on Transparency 7. What am I missing?
   - Transparency 16 – Deserves explanation. Is this simulation or experimental data?
   - Transparency 17 – Looks to me compares favorably with Transparency 10. Comments?
2. Beam Loading Compensation: Berenc *et al*, May 5, 2003
   - Page 1 – $R_s$ should be 250K$\Omega$ to be consistent with Page 2.
   - Pages 2-5 – tScales not readable. Some discussion would be useful. Table 1 on Page 2 is good.
   - Page 9 – How about a run-through of this model?
   - Page 10 – Interpret Fig. 8.
3. RF Department Note Draft, August 25, 2003
   - This note deserves considerable discussion, as it is the current summary of the feedback situation.
   - The charge to the committee implies that a recommendation on the amplifier quote from CUBIC Defense Applications, Inc, would be appropriate.